

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 23-29 are currently pending. Claims 1-17 and 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

An interview was conducted on April 7, 2004 and distinctions between canonical locations and control points in the applicant's claimed invention were discussed. An understanding of the distinctions was acknowledged by the examiner.

Support for the phrase "sections of predetermined proportions" was also discussed. An example of one possible way to divide a Bezier shape into "sections of predetermined proportions" is shown in FIG. 6 and FIG. 7 and referred to on page 5, lines 26-28 of the specification which state:

"the vertical axis shows the amount by which the end points and the section dividing points... on the curve (i.e., the canonical points) are affected by dragging the curve at point C(t_{drag}) to P_{drag}."

In response to the examiner's comments related to the phrase "re-determining the control points of the Bezier shape based on the new positions of the canonical locations, the Bezier shape that is governed by the re-determined control points having a path that is not dependent on any user-specified information other than the user-specified change in position," the applicant has amended the claim as discussed during the interview. The phrase has been rewritten as a dependent claim to clarify that the Bezier shape "has a path or surface that is determined by the path or surface of the Bezier shape that existed prior to receiving the user-specified change in position, and by the user-specified change in position." Notwithstanding the applicant's remarks in response to the previous office action and based on the comments by the examiner that the canonical locations distinguish from the prior art, it is the applicant's current position that claim 1 is patentable based on the inclusion of canonical locations as described in the amended claim 1 and without the clause related to the determining of the control points for the new Bezier shape. Independent claims 16, 17, 23, and 24 include similar limitations and are patentable for reasons similar to claim 1.

Applicant : Martin E. Newell et al.
Serial No. : 09/458,917
Filed : December 10, 1999
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-353001 / P328


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The applicant asks that all claims be allowed. If a discussion of the current amendments is desired, please contact David Feigenbaum at 517-521-7817.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 07844-353001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/13/14



David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906